

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/735,551	12/14/2000	Satoshi Kidooka	P20361	6566	
7055	7590 11/28/2005		EXAM	INER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE			LAM, A	LAM, ANN Y	
RESTON, V			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1641		

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/735,551	KIDOOKA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ann Y. Lam	1641			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I.  nely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 At</u> 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This     3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 29 is/are pending in the application Papers	vn from consideration.				
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> </ul>					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 4, 2005 has been entered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu, Japanese Utility Model Publication No. Hei-7-51066, in view of Bellhouse et al., 6,010,478.

Shimizu discloses the invention substantially as claimed. More specifically, Shimizu discloses an endoscope comprising:

a treatment instrument channel (i.e., endoscope, page 1);

an endoscopic spraying instrument (4) comprising:

a liquid supplying tube (7) configured to pass liquid therethrough and to be removably inserted into the treatment instrument channel (endoscopes, page 1);

a rotatingly guiding groove (8) disposed at a leading end side of the supplying tube and configured to rotate the liquid about a central axis;

a liquid rotating chamber (10) disposed at a leading end side of the rotatingly guiding groove, the liquid rotating chamber configured to rotate the liquid therein;

a spray nozzle (distal end portion of 10) formed in a leading end wall of the liquid rotating chamber and configured to discharge the liquid from the liquid rotating chamber; and

a wall surface (5a and 5b) outwardly extending from an outer periphery of the spray nozzle and is a tapered surface.

However, Shimizu does not disclose an annular, protruded wall extending in a forward direction and at an angle different from said wall surface. This limitation is taught by Bellhouse et al.

Bellhouse et al. disclose an injection device with a nozzle that has annular, protruded wall (13, see fig. 1) extending in a forward direction and at an angle different from a wall surface (near 12). Bellhouse et al. teach that particles are carried out through element (13) and into contact with a target surface (col. 7, lines 38-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an annular, protruded wall as taught by Bellhouse et al. in the Shimizu

Application/Control Number: 09/735,551 Page 4

Art Unit: 1641

invention because Bellhouse et al. teach that such a wall provides the advantage of carrying out particles out of a divergent surface into contact with a target surface. Also, such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size or shape of a component. A change in size or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

As to the following claims, Shimizu teaches the limitations as follows.

As to claim 3, a portion of said wall surface (5b) is defined by a planar surface perpendicular to an axis of the spray nozzle. (Examiner notes that Applicant has not specified in claim 3 as to which axis Applicant is referring, e.g., longitudinal axis, etc.)

As to claim 4, a portion of said wall surface (5a) is parallel to an axis of the spray nozzle (see page 6, last paragraph, and figure 2.) (Examiner notes that Applicant has not specified in claim 4 as to which axis Applicant is referring, e.g., longitudinal axis, etc.)

As to claim 5, a wall surface of the annular, protruded wall (5a and 5b) is defined by a forwardly spread surface or a forwardly constricted surface (see page 6, last paragraph, and figure 2.)

As to claim 29, the liquid supply tube (7) is substantially coaxial with the spray nozzle (10), (see figure 2.)

Response to Arguments

Application/Control Number: 09/735,551 Page 5

Art Unit: 1641

Applicant's arguments with respect to the above rejected claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Y. Lam whose telephone number is 571-272-0822. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Sat 11-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.L. ()()

LONG V. LE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

4/21/00